

Today's Topics:

ARRL
BUSINESS allocations
How old WE are.... (2 msgs)
SE Regional scanner mailing list
Wall Street...cordless...; now cellular encryption

Date: 8 Dec 89 12:40:27 GMT

From: hpda!hpwala!hpnjld!eyg@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Ed Gilbert)

Subject: ARRL

Message-ID: <4140006@hpnjld.HP.COM>

> I'll start with question of my own. On 10 meters, from my QTH in
> central Ohio, I can only work stations that are about 2000 miles
> or more away from me, west coast, Europe, SA, Japan, but no south
> east US, New England, etc. I'm using a 2 wavelength dipole that's
> one wavelength above ground. A friend suggested that if I lower the
> antenna, I'll raise the radiation angle and skip in closer. Anyone
> have any experience with this sort of thing? (I don't intend to
> lower my antenna, but I might build another one near the ground
> if this concept works.)

I think that your experience has a lot more to do with propagation
on 10 meters than with the height of you antenna. I've used antennas
that are much higher than 1 wavelength on 10m, and haven't had any
trouble working stuff closer than 2000 miles when conditions permitted.
If you lower your antenna, you will just lose more power in heating
up the ground beneath it.

Ed Gilbert, WA2SRQ

Date: 11 Dec 89 16:01 EST

From: WMLBTAM%UCCCV1.BITNET@CORNELL.cit.cornell.edu

Subject: BUSINESS allocations

Date: 11 December 1989, 15:54:18 EST

From: WMLBTAM at UCCCV1

To: INFO-HAMS at WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

Subj: BUSINESS allocations

I know this isn't strictly ham-related (how much of the traffic here IS,
nowadays!?) but I figure that HERE'S WHERE THE KNOWLEDGE IS.

My wife's library is trying to use radio modems to link terminals in their book mobiles to the mini in the main library which handles circulation records.

The company who handled their data communications says the frequencies they're using (sought and selected by the company on the library's behalf) are o.k. for both voice and data communications. They've received a complaint of interference from a couple of other folks (they were TOLD they had the channel to themselves in this area!) that, not only are they interfering, but that it's because they're running data on these channels when they're only authorized for voice.

Does this make any sense--do the business band allocations have voice-only and data-allowable sub-allocations? BTW, her freqs are 461.4/466.4MHz.

Thanks for any info/comments...

Ted

```
=====
Theodore Allan Morris          | 231 Bethesda Avenue, ML# 574
University of Cincinnati Medical Center | Cincinnati, OH 45267-0574
Medical Center Information and Communications | 513-558-6046 (W), 731-3451 (H)
Information Research and Development | WMLBTAM@UCCCCVM1, NTS WB8VNV,
=====| or AppleLink U1091
Call me up and I'll talk data to ya'! | (you-one-zero-nine-one)
=====
```

Date: 10 Dec 89 21:47:26 GMT
From: hpda!hpwala!hpnjld!eyg@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Ed Gilbert)
Subject: How old WE are....
Message-ID: <4140008@hpnjld.HP.COM>

Sorry about the last response, I tried incorrectly to abort it.

As long as you're taking a survey, why not get some info on operating habits, equipment, antennas, %cw vs phone activity, %hf vs vhf or uhf activity, license class, etc. I'd find this info useful (although I'm not volunteering here to collect it :-)

Ed Gilbert, WA2SRQ

Date: 8 Dec 89 15:25:34 GMT

From: hpda!hpwala!hpnjld!eyg@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Ed Gilbert)
Subject: How old WE are....
Message-ID: <4140007@hpnjld.HP.COM>

/ hpnjld:rec.ham-radio / root@mjbbtn.UUCP (Mark J. Bailey) / 7:56 am Dec 6, 1989 /

I got to thinking the other day about Ham Radio and the guys and gals here in rec.ham-radio.*. With all the talk (by supposed experts) that the majority of Ham's are getting older and that there are severe shortages in the newer generations of Americans coming into the hobby, I started pondering the question of just who WE are in terms of the age distribution.

Since many of the sites on Usenet are academic sites, one can quickly determine that there has to be a certain degree of young adults. But when you start to examine sites that represent companies, and sites that are public access in nature, it gets really hard to tell from that line of thinking. Also, the obvious know-how to operate computers and software is really no solid indication either since it seems that most Hams (young and older) are technical (to some degree) to begin with, and the computer has been mostly more a friend than an enemy. It appears that older Hams have adapted very well to using the computer.

Well, I pondered on it some more (not all at once :-)), and I decided to post this message here. What I would like to do, is to take a quick little survey. The 2 questions are VERY simple. You can just do a direct email reply. Here they are:

1) How old are you?

2) How many years have you been a Ham Radio Ooperator?

I have done no prior investigation on this; this is just some spur of the moment curiosity. What I would like to do is perform some simple (yet informative) statistics on the results I get back and post them back here to the group. I will keep all responses confidential, ie., no one will know who is what age, etc. :-)

I just thought it might be interesting to find out who WE are and to see if the rec.ham-radio.* naturally attracts younger people due to the nature of its underlying environment (the computer net). Some of you may not give a hoot. Well, that is fine. I will be taken up very little public bandwidth (I hope!). But it seems to me that it IS an important question since there are reports that do show (I don't have them here, but recall seeing it before somewhere) Hams as a whole are getting older. If this median we have here is condusive to bringing in today's generation, then we should recognize it as such. I am not attempting to do that now, just get an idea of where we fall.

Any and all reponses welcome! Please use direct email as net bandwidth can be used for better things.

Thanks for your cooperation!

73's,

Mark.

--

Mark J. Bailey, N4XHX "Ya'll com bak naw, ya hear!"
USMAIL: 511 Memorial Blvd., Murfreesboro, TN 37129
VOICE: +1 615 893 0098 | JobSoft
UUCP: ...!{ames,mit-eddie}!attctc!mjbtn!mjb | Design & Development Co.
DOMAIN: mjb@mjbtn.MFEE.TN.US CIS: 76314,160 | Murfreesboro, TN USA
<KA9Q-UNIX-USERS Mailing List - Subscribe: ka9q-unix-requests@mjbtn.mfee.tn.us>

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 17:31:15 EST
From: pswecker@med.unc.edu (Peter St.Wecker)
Subject: SE Regional scanner mailing list
Message-ID: <8912112231.AA07010@pelham.med.unc.edu>

TO ALL SCANNER OWNERS IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN STATES:
(and anyone else whose interested)

I am sending out a "feeler" to see if there is any interest in setting up a mailing list of scanner-users in the SE U.S. I could see this list as a local supplement to SWL-L/rec.radio.shortwave, which appears to be establishing itself as a national list for all types of monitoring (150kHz - 800mHz+). Since much of the scanning hobby has a local appeal, a regional mailing list might be in order. (other regions may wish to have the same).

Gregg Stefancik at Clemson has offered to establish an unmoderated mailing list if the interest is there. So if you are interested in having such a list, drop me a note at: pswecker@med.unc.edu

-- Peter St.Wecker (RCMA NC097 [I think!])

Peter St.Wecker Internet:pswecker@med.unc.edu
(919) 966-1096 UUCP:pswecker@uncmed.uucp
Dept. of Physiology, Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill NC
If we knew what we were doing, it wouldn't be research

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 19:19 EST

From: Ed Schwalenberg <Ed@ALDERAAN.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>
Subject: Wall Street...cordless...; now cellular encryption
Message-ID: <19891212001947.2.ED@PEREGRINE.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 89 14:00:50 CST
From: dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD)

The notion of encryption of public communications is an oxymoron. In order for encryption to afford security, the method must be known only to a few who have a need to know; then it should be changed at irregular intervals.

Not true. Kerckhoff first enunciated several laws of cryptology, one of which is that the "enemy" is assumed to know the encryption system in use. Security must therefore reside entirely in the encryption key. If the key is non-random, or is used more than once, it is theoretically (but often not practically) possible to break the cipher. If the key meets the random and one-time tests, and is kept out of "enemy" hands, it is theoretically and practically impossible to break a cipher.

The idea that "the method must be known only to those who have a need to know" is popularly known as "security through obscurity". It doesn't work. The method can be discovered just as easily as the key, if the key is non-random or non-one-time. From a military point of view, you can't afford to throw away all of your cipher machines (or algorithms) just because the enemy gets his hands on one. See "The Codebreakers", by David Kahn, ca. 1966.

(In the interest of avoiding flames, I'm not addressing the issue of encrypting cellular phones, just correcting a common misconception.)

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1005
